



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/769,981	01/25/2001	Aladar A. Szalay	13070-1	5416
7590 01/21/2005			EXAMINER	
SHELDON & MAK			HINES, JANA A	
Attn: David A. Farah, M.D. 225 South Lake Avenue, Suite 900 Pasadena, CA 90101			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1645	
			DATE MAILED: 01/21/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/769,981	SZALAY ET AL.				
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Ja-Na Hines	1645				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 27 October 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applicated) a timely filed amendment which	tion. A proper reply to a places the application in				
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CFI extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply cellater than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection. IE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be						
(a) they raise new issues that would require further		see NOTE below);				
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	•					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.				
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject		-				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:		dered but does NOT place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed: <i>None</i> .						
Claim(s) objected to: None.						
Claim(s) rejected: 1-12.						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 23-32.		•				
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	roved or b) disapproved by t	he Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	LZX				
10. Other:	SUPE	LYNETTE R. F. SMITH RVISORY PATENT EXAMINEP CHNOLOGY CENTER 1600				

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The amendment will not be entered because it raises new issues that would require further search and consideration. The new issues are drawn to the after final amendment which now limits the method of evaluating whether an implantable material will allow bacteria to pass through. Previously the claims were not drawn to non-living implantable material, thus the claims and the prior art used in the rejections do not comprise this newly recited limitation. Thus the limitation requires further consideration and search. Moreover the amendment will not be entered because it fails to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplfying the issues for appeal. Finally, it is noted that the after final amendment touches the merits of the application and its entry would not be proper in view of applicants failure to show good and sufficient reasons why said amendments are necessary and why they were not presented earlier. Therefore, the after final amendment will not be entered.

It is also noted that applicants arguments drawn to the after final amendments and the rejections of record are moot in view of the nonentry of the after final amendments. Thus the rejections of record are maintained for the reasons already of record.